



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,589	02/18/2004	Ronald Baruzzi	2003-0119	4749
83658	7590	08/07/2009	EXAMINER	
AT & T Legal Department - WS			PATEL, HEMANT SHANTILAL	
Attn: Patent Docketing				
Room 2A-207			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
One AT & T Way			2614	
Bedminster, NJ 07921				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/782,589	BARUZZI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	HEMANT PATEL	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's submission filed on May 21, 2009 in response to Office Action dated February 25, 2009 has been entered. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed May 21, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. **Regarding claim 1 rejection over Smyk in view of Wilson,** the Applicant has argued that "Smyk does not disclose that the call is directed based on the type of incoming trunk" (Remarks, pg. 7 ll. 13-14), and "there is no description in Wilson of directing a call received at a first subnetwork to a second subnetwork based on the type of incoming trunk" (Remarks, pg. 7 ll. 24-25). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., call directed based on the type of incoming trunk) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

4. **Regarding claim 1 rejection over Smyk in view of Soncodi,** the Applicant has referred to arguments with respect to Smyk same as discussed above. Further, the Applicant has argued that "Soncodi trunk groups do not comprise different types of trunks" (Remarks, pg. 9 ll. 18-19). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to

applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., different types of trunks) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Further, the Applicant has argued that "Soncodi does not disclose that calls are processed based on a particular type of incoming trunk that the calls come in on. A type of incoming trunk may be, for example, a switched access or the nodal trunk" (Remarks, pg. 9 II. 20-22). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Soncodi clearly teaches of "methods and system for providing SIP trunk groups" and "Once the incoming SIP trunk group is identified, the incoming trunk group is used to select per-trunk-group call processing" (Paragraph 0006). Thus it clearly teaches of SIP type trunks. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., switched or nodal type trunks) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

5. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pgs. 8-11, filed May 21, 2009, with respect to claim rejections over March in view of Wilson and over March in view of Soncodi have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims over March in view of Wilson and over March in view of Soncodi have been withdrawn.

***Claim Objections***

6. Claims 2-12 are objected to because of the following informalities: These dependent claims recite "A method" referring to parent claims. It should be "The method". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim 10 recites the limitation "the provisioning system" in ll. 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyk (US Patent No. 6,603,760 B1), and further in view of Wilson (US Patent No. 5,555,288).

***Regarding claim 1,*** Smyk teaches of a method of processing calls in an aggregate telecommunications network having at least two subnetworks, comprising the steps of:

creating a set of decision criteria (col. 4 ll. 65-col. 5 ll. 8), applied in a first (Fig. 4 item 402) of said at least two subnetworks, that determine which calls entering said first of said at least two sub networks should receive service processing in said second (Fig. 4 item 400) of said at least two subnetworks (col. 5 ll. 10-12);

for calls that are to receive service processing in a second subnetwork, guiding those calls to that subnetwork (col. 5 ll. 12-21, 28-57; col. 6 ll. 3-47; guiding calls to PSTN);

invoking service processing by said second of said at least two subnetworks (col. 6 ll. 48-57) (col. 4 ll. 64-col. 9 ll. 50).

Smyk teaches of guiding calls and providing service based on information for a line from which call comes in (col. 5 ll. 46-61), but Smyk does not teach of providing service based on the type of a trunk from which the call comes in.

Grouping trunks of same type in a common set as a trunk group was very well known in the art, and the trunk group of the trunk identified various parameters including

trunk type associated with the trunk for common processing of calls from the multiple trunks sharing the same characteristics. (Note: the **trunk type** determination as disclosed in the instant application paragraph 0031 **is dependent upon** the attributes of the incoming switch **trunk group**. Note: The Applicant's attention is drawn to US Patent No. 3,564,149 to Charles Funk et. al. col. 23 ll. 21-25 wherein it teaches that trunk group information provides the trunk type and origination of the call, US Patent No. 6,459,788 to Khuc et. al. col. 28 ll. 7-20 wherein it teaches that trunk group identifies the trunk type, and also Newton's Telecom Dictionary by Harry Newton, 16th edition, February 2000, ISBN # 1-57820-053-9, published by Telecom Books, pg 884 describes that trunk group is a group of essentially like trunks that go between the same geographical points, and trunk group performs the same function as a single trunk.).

However, in the same field of communication, Wilson teaches of grouping multiple trunks of the same type in a trunk group by inheriting common characteristics (col. 6 ll. 30-col. 7 ll. 44, col. 17 ll. 38-48, ll. 55-62 show multiple trunk groups with their respective individual trunks with the same type of T1-E&M), and to couple trunks in a particular trunk group to their specialized module for special processing based on the type of trunk the call comes in (col. 18 ll. 1-8), and also update characteristics of all trunks in a trunk group by changing parameter at the trunk group level (col. 18 ll. 10-col. 19 ll. 10 changing the trunk type for all trunks in trunk group 01 from T1-E&M to T1-E&M-Wink with single change command) (col. 2 ll. 38-43 operating parameters of trunk group are defined as trunk type configuration).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smyk to group links with common characteristics as a trunk group and provide specialized processing based on trunk group defined trunk type as taught by Wilson in order to “provide mechanism which allows rapid and simple reconfiguration of a voice processing system in order to enable the system to operate with a plurality of different telephone lines and switching equipment” (Wilson, col. 2 ll. 15-18).

***Regarding claim 2,*** Smyk teaches of the method further comprising the step of: providing information conveyed by signaling that accompanies the call guided from the first subnetwork to the second subnetwork that is sufficient for causing the invocation of service processing in the second subnetwork (col. 6 ll. 11-47 SM sending set-up message to class 5 switch; col. 6 ll. 34-47 SM causing signaling of ABCD bits for connection necessary for invocation of service).

***Regarding claim 3,*** Smyk teaches of the method further comprising the step of: providing information conveyed by signaling that accompanies the call guided from the first to second subnetwork that is sufficient for supporting service processing in the second subnetwork (col. 6 ll. 11-47 SM sending set-up message to class 5 switch and SM causing signaling of ABCD bits for connection sufficient for supporting of service; col. 6 ll. 48-57 dialed digits sufficient for service are conveyed via signaling).

***Regarding claim 4,*** Smyk teaches of the method wherein said information conveyed by signaling comprises:

information selected from the group of routing number, *original dialed number*, an explicit trigger **or** a combination thereof (col. 6 ll. 11-13, 48-57, information in set-up message and dialed digits i.e. original dialed number).

**Regarding claim 5**, Smyk teaches of the method wherein said associated information conveyed by signaling is selected from the group of information available to the first subnetwork *calling party number* (col. 5 ll. 46-53 *subscription of customer based on calling party number*), *original dialed number* (col. 6 ll. 48-57 *telephony or AIN services based on collected digits i.e. original dialed number*), routing number, charge number, Originating Line Information, Customer ID, **or** a combination thereof.

**Regarding claim 6**, Smyk teaches of the method further comprising the step of: targeting a specific element **or** type of element within said second subnetwork of said at least two sub networks to invoke service processing for the call (col. 6 ll. 11-13 specific class 5 switch; col. 8 ll. 46-47 PSTN type of network element).

**Regarding claim 7**, Smyk teaches of the method where the selection of the specific element **or** type of element within said second subnetwork may be based on the location of the origination of the call into the first said subnetwork (col. 5 ll. 1-7 local service provider for a subscriber is based on subscriber line location originating the call).

**Regarding claim 8**, Smyk teaches of the method wherein said decision criteria is selected from at least **one of** the group of:  
*service type, features potentially applicable within a given service type (col.5 ll. 46-53 service subscription)*, called party number, original dialed number, how close the

ingress switch in said first subnetwork is in terms of some proximity measure to said second subnetwork, the identity or type of the particular trunk group over which the call entered said first of said at least two subnetworks, *the ANI of the call* (col. 5 ll. 46-53 *service subscription related to customer line i.e. ANI*), the calling party number of the call, the current load allocation of the first of said at least two subnetworks, the current load allocation of the second of said at least two sub networks, the existence of a qualifying routing plan or routing information to send a call into said second of said at least two subnetworks, *an on/off toggle administrable from a work center* (col. 5 ll. 4-9 *toggling service subscription*), the type of service processor requires to handle the call *or* a combination thereof.

**Regarding claim 9,** Smyk teaches of the method wherein the guidance of calls to the second subnetwork is responsive to a routing number (col. 6 ll. 54-57 routing based on dialed number).

12. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyk and Wilson as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Bays (US Patent Application publication No. 2002/0141378 A1).

**Regarding claim 10,** Smyk teaches of identifying and using routing to route the call (col. 6 ll. 46-57, col. 7 ll. 11-20) but Smyk and Wilson do not teach of the provisioning system responsible for installing Routing Plans as part of service logic examines each plan to determine its eligibility for service processing in the second subnetwork.

However, in the same field of communication, Bays teaches of provisioning system (routing control device) responsible for installing Routing Plans (routing rule sets) installs and examines each plan to determine its eligibility for service processing in the network (Paragraph 0028-0029).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smyk and Wilson with provisioning system that installs route sets (routing plans) and examines each route set to determine its eligibility for service processing in the network as taught by Bays in order to facilitate "configuration and deployment of inter-domain routing policies" (Bays, Paragraph 0004).

13. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyk and Wilson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Funk (US Patent No. 5,185,785).

***Regarding claims 11, 12,*** Smyk and Wilson do not specifically teach about switched access trunk and nodal trunk.

However, in the same field of communication, Funk teaches of identifying nodal trunk (col. 7 ll. 16-21) and switched access trunk (col. 7 ll. 22-29) connecting two points in the network and providing selective recording for billing based on data in associated trunk subgroup (col. 8 ll. 7-16).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smyk and Wilson to identify as switched access and nodal access trunks in the network as taught by Funk in order to provide "a simplified,

more cost-effective recording and rating method to enable carrier networks to accurately bill customers for these nodal services, as well as accommodating non-nodal services and future service applications" (Funk col. 1 ll. 51-55).

14. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyk, and further in view of Soncodi (US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0074026 A1).

***Regarding claim 1,*** Smyk teaches of a method of processing calls in an aggregate telecommunications network having at least two subnetworks, comprising the steps of:

creating a set of decision criteria (col. 4 ll. 65-col. 5 ll. 8), applied in a first (Fig. 4 item 402) of said at least two subnetworks, that determine which calls entering said first of said at least two sub networks should receive service processing in said second (Fig. 4 item 400) of said at least two subnetworks (col. 5 ll. 10-12);

for calls that are to receive service processing in a second subnetwork, guiding those calls to that subnetwork (col. 5 ll. 12-21, 28-57; col. 6 ll. 3-47; guiding calls to PSTN);

invoking service processing by said second of said at least two subnetworks (col. 6 ll. 48-57) (col. 4 ll. 64-col. 9 ll. 50).

Smyk teaches of guiding calls and providing service based on information for a line from which call comes in (col. 5 ll. 46-61), but Smyk does not teach of providing service based on the type of a trunk from which the call comes in.

Grouping trunks of same type in a common set as a trunk group was very well known in the art, and the trunk group of the trunk identified various parameters including trunk type associated with the trunk for common processing of calls from the multiple trunks sharing the same characteristics. (Note: the **trunk type** determination as disclosed in the instant application paragraph 0031 **is dependent upon** the attributes of the incoming switch **trunk group**. Note: The Applicant's attention is drawn to US Patent No. 3,564,149 to Charles Funk et. al. col. 23 ll. 21-25 wherein it teaches that trunk group information provides the trunk type and origination of the call, US Patent No. 6,459,788 to Khuc et. al. col. 28 ll. 7-20 wherein it teaches that trunk group identifies the trunk type, and also Newton's Telecom Dictionary by Harry Newton, 16th edition, February 2000, ISBN # 1-57820-053-9, published by Telecom Books, pg 884 describes that trunk group is a group of essentially like trunks that go between the same geographical points, and trunk group performs the same function as a single trunk.).

However, in the same field of communication, Soncodi teaches of grouping incoming trunks of same type in an incoming trunk group (Paragraph 0002 trunk groups are physical facilities i.e. trunks between switching offices and Paragraphs 0003, 0019-0020, 0025 individually teach that trunk groups are identified based on the trunk type over which message is received), and guiding calls and providing service based on information for a trunk group (hence trunk type) from which call comes in (Paragraphs 0019 selectively processing calls based on incoming trunk group and hence trunk type, 0021 selecting per-trunk-group call processor for per-trunk-group call features associated with individual trunk group, 0022, individual call treatments based on per-

trunk-group data, 0030 screening or call blocking per incoming trunk group, 0033 quality of service, cost of service, priority for routing based on incoming trunk group, 0036 AIN features associated with incoming trunk group, 0037 routing and blocking calls based on incoming trunk group, 0039 routing based on particular incoming trunk group).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smyk to group incoming trunk types in an incoming trunk group, and guiding calls and providing service based on a trunk group (and hence types of trunks in the trunk group) from which call comes in as taught by Soncodi in order to provide “methods and systems for identifying SIP trunk groups and for selectively processing calls on a per-trunk-group basis” (Soncodi, Paragraph 0005) and enabling “PSTN-like-trunk-group features to be implemented in a SIP environment” (Soncodi, Paragraph 0040).

***Regarding claim 2,*** Smyk teaches of the method further comprising the step of: providing information conveyed by signaling that accompanies the call guided from the first subnetwork to the second subnetwork that is sufficient for causing the invocation of service processing in the second subnetwork (col. 6 ll. 11-47 SM sending set-up message to class 5 switch; col. 6 ll. 34-47 SM causing signaling of ABCD bits for connection necessary for invocation of service).

Soncodi teaches of providing information conveyed by signaling (SIP) that accompanies the call guided from the first subnetwork to the second subnetwork that is sufficient for causing the invocation of service processing in the second subnetwork (Paragraphs 0019-0020).

**Regarding claim 3,** Smyk teaches of the method further comprising the step of: providing information conveyed by signaling that accompanies the call guided from the first to second subnetwork that is sufficient for supporting service processing in the second subnetwork (col. 6 ll. 11-47 SM sending set-up message to class 5 switch and SM causing signaling of ABCD bits for connection sufficient for supporting of service; col. 6 ll. 48-57 dialed digits sufficient for service are conveyed via signaling).

Soncodi teaches of providing information conveyed by signaling that accompanies the call guided from the first to second subnetwork that is sufficient for supporting service processing in the second subnetwork (Paragraphs 0019-0020).

**Regarding claim 4,** Smyk teaches of the method wherein said information conveyed by signaling comprises:

information selected from the group of routing number, *original dialed number*, an explicit trigger **or** a combination thereof (col. 6 ll. 11-13, 48-57, information in set-up message and dialed digits i.e. original dialed number).

Soncodi teaches of information selected from the group of *routing number*, *original dialed number*, an explicit trigger **or** a combination thereof (Paragraph 0020 SIP via header information).

**Regarding claim 5,** Smyk teaches of the method wherein said associated information conveyed by signaling is selected from the group of information available to the first subnetwork *calling party number* (col. 5 ll. 46-53 *subscription of customer based on calling party number*), *original dialed number* (col. 6 ll. 48-57 *telephony or AIN*

services based on collected digits i.e. original dialed number), routing number, charge number, Originating Line Information, Customer ID, **or** a combination thereof.

Soncodi teaches of the method wherein said associated information conveyed by signaling is selected from the group of information available to the first subnetwork calling party number, *original dialed number (Paragraph 0030 toll calls, Paragraph 0033 911 calls, Paragraph 0036 LNP query for dialed number, Paragraph 0039 translating digits), routing number (Paragraph 0020 via header information, Paragraph 0036 inserting routing number by sending peer for the destination peer)*, charge number, *Originating Line Information (source IP address)*, Customer ID, **or** a combination thereof.

**Regarding claim 6**, Smyk teaches of the method further comprising the step of: targeting a specific element **or** type of element within said second subnetwork of said at least two sub networks to invoke service processing for the call (col. 6 ll. 11-13 specific class 5 switch; col. 8 ll. 46-47 PSTN type of network element).

Soncodi teaches of per-trunk-group call processor for selectively processing calls based on service specified in per-trunk-group table (Paragraph 0019).

**Regarding claim 7**, Smyk teaches of the method where the selection of the specific element **or** type of element within said second subnetwork may be based on the location of the origination of the call into the first said subnetwork (col. 5 ll. 1-7 local service provider for a subscriber is based on subscriber line location originating the call).

Soncodi teaches of selecting per-trunk-group call processor for selectively processing calls based on incoming trunk group from which call (Paragraph 0019) and the identification of this trunk group is based on the location of the origination of the call (Paragraph 0022 source IP address parameter).

**Regarding claim 8,** Smyk teaches of the method wherein said decision criteria is selected from at least **one of** the group of:

*service type, features potentially applicable within a given service type (col.5 II. 46-53 service subscription), called party number, original dialed number, how close the ingress switch in said first subnetwork is in terms of some proximity measure to said second subnetwork, the identity or type of the particular trunk group over which the call entered said first of said at least two subnetworks, the ANI of the call (col.5 II. 46-53 service subscription related to customer line i.e. ANI), the calling party number of the call, the current load allocation of the first of said at least two subnetworks, the current load allocation of the second of said at least two sub networks, the existence of a qualifying routing plan or routing information to send a call into said second of said at least two subnetworks, an on/off toggle administrable from a work center (col. 5 II. 4-9 toggling service subscription), the type of service processor requires to handle the call or a combination thereof.*

Soncodi teaches of said decision criteria selected from at least **one of** the group of:

*service type, features potentially applicable within a given service type (Paragraph 0022), called party number, original dialed number (Paragraph 0033), how*

close the ingress switch in said first subnetwork is in terms of some proximity measure to said second subnetwork, *the identity or type of the particular trunk group over which the call entered said first of said at least two subnetworks (Paragraph 0019-0025)*, the ANI of the call, the calling party number of the call, *the current load allocation of the first of said at least two subnetworks, the current load allocation of the second of said at least two sub networks (Paragraph 0027, 0037)*, *the existence of a qualifying routing plan or routing information to send a call into said second of said at least two subnetworks (Paragraphs 0035, 0037)*, *an on/off toggle administrable from a work center (Paragraph 0037 turn on/off based on time)*, *the type of service processor requires to handle the call (Paragraph 0029) or a combination thereof.*

**Regarding claim 9,** Smyk teaches of the method wherein the guidance of calls to the second subnetwork is responsive to a routing number (col. 6 ll. 54-57 routing based on dialed number), and Soncodi teaches of the method wherein the guidance of calls to the second subnetwork is responsive to a routing number (Paragraphs 0035-0037).

15. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyk and Soncodi as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Bays (US Patent Application publication No. 2002/0141378 A1).

**Regarding claim 10,** Smyk teaches of identifying and using routing to route the call (col. 6 ll. 46-57, col. 7 ll. 11-20), and Soncodi teaches of identifying and using routing to route the call (Paragraphs 0022-0023) but Smyk and Soncodi do not teach of

the provisioning system responsible for installing Routing Plans as part of service logic examines each plan to determine its eligibility for service processing in the second subnetwork.

However, in the same field of communication, Bays teaches of provisioning system (routing control device) responsible for installing Routing Plans (routing rule sets) installs and examines each plan to determine its eligibility for service processing in the network (Paragraph 0028-0029).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smyk and Soncodi with provisioning system that installs route sets (routing plans) and examines each route set to determine its eligibility for service processing in the network as taught by Bays in order to facilitate “configuration and deployment of inter-domain routing policies” (Bays, Paragraph 0004).

16. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smyk and Soncodi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Funk (US Patent No. 5,185,785).

***Regarding claims 11, 12,*** Smyk and Soncodi do not specifically teach about switched access trunk and nodal trunk.

However, in the same field of communication, Funk teaches of identifying nodal trunk (col. 7 ll. 16-21) and switched access trunk (col. 7 ll. 22-29) connecting two points in the network and providing selective recording for billing based on data in associated trunk subgroup (col. 8 ll. 7-16).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Smyk and Soncodi to identify as switched access and nodal access trunks in the network as taught by Funk in order to enhance per-trunk-group based billing (Sonicodi, Paragraph 0038) to provide "a simplified, more cost-effective recording and rating method to enable carrier networks to accurately bill customers for these nodal services, as well as accommodating non-nodal services and future service applications" (Funk col. 1 ll. 51-55).

***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 6,411,697 Creamer

US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0152339 Scott

US Patent Application Publication No. 2008/0317003 Knauf

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HEMANT PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-8620. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hemant Patel  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2614

/Hemant Patel/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Application/Control Number: 10/782,589  
Art Unit: 2614

Page 21